



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,503	03/10/2006	Jean-Yves Bitterlich	071308 1015 (2003P13403SWO)	4152
31625	7590	08/04/2009	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. PATENT DEPARTMENT 98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500 AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039			PHANTANA ANGKOOK, DAVID	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			2175
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
08/04/2009	PAPER			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/571,503	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BITTERLICH, JEAN-YVES
	<b>Examiner</b> David Phantana-angkool	<b>Art Unit</b> 2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2009.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4-12 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 4-12 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This application has been reassigned to Examiner David Phantana-angkool.
2. This action is responsive to Amendments filed on April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2009.
3. Claims 4-12 are pending in the case. Claims 4, 7, and 10 are independent claims.
4. Applicants amended claims 4, 7, and 10.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. **The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:**

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fernandes, US# 6,014,135.**

**As for independent claim 4:**

Fernandes shows a *method for generating an object processing platform between an object computer and a processing computer, wherein an ad hoc screen assembly is performed by the object computer with the processing computer to couple a respective input and/or output device, comprising of*

- *activating at the object computer a local file processing function on the processing computer*  
(Fernandes shows activating an icon, by using a pointing device in 11: 40-43. Fernandes shows a collaborative routing system which allows the user to route or share documents from one user to another in column 12, lines 51-68),
- *generating an object processing platform by moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer*

(Fernandes shows routing the created or stored document by dragging the representative icon to the desired user icon/interaction area in 11: 35-55. Fernandes shows that the system routes the desired document from one user to another user or from one computer to another computer, 12: 58-68. The *interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer* can be the same interaction area as view by the object computer and processing computer since the object computer and the processing computer share and display the same type of graphical user interface screen by logging into groupware system as shown in column 11, lines 34-63 and column 12, lines 50-68, and Figs. 5 and 6).

- *wherein activating the local file processing function comprises moving the object from the object computer to the interaction area* (Fernandes shows moving the object in 11:40-43).

**As for dependent claim 5:**

Fernandes discloses *the method according to claim 4, further, comprising an application-specific processing of the object is started by a further coupling of the object to an application icon on the display belonging to the processing computer* (10:30-40).

**As for dependent claim 6:**

Fernandes shows *the method according to claim 5, wherein object-computer-specific data of the object is converted into application-specific data* (10:40-45).

**As for independent claim 7:**

Fernandes shows a system for generating an object processing platform between an *object computer and a processing computer, wherein an ad hoc screen assembly is performed by the object computer with the processing computer to couple a respective input and/or output device* (Fernandes shows activating a icon, by using a pointing device in 11: 40-43 and Fernandes shows a collaborative routing system which allows the user to route or share documents from one user to another in column 12, lines 51-68), *wherein the object computer is operable to activate a local file processing function on the processing computer, wherein the object processing platform is generated by moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer, and wherein activating the local file processing function comprises moving the*

Art Unit: 2175

*object from the object computer to the interaction area* (Fernandes shows routing the created or stored document by dragging the representative icon to the desired user icon/interaction area in 11: 35-55.

Fernandes shows that the system routes the desired document from one user to another user or from one computer to another computer, 12: 58-68. The *interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer* can be the same interaction area as view by the object computer and processing computer since the object computer and the processing computer share and display the same type of graphical user interface screen by logging into groupware system as shown in column 11, lines 34-63, column 12, lines 50-68, and Figs. 5 and 6).

**As for dependent claims 8 and 9:**

Claims 8 and 9 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

**As for independent claim 10:**

Fernandes shows a system comprising:

*a combination of an object computer and a processing computer, wherein the combination is operable to perform an ad hoc screen assembly to couple a respective input and/or output device* (Fernandes shows activating a icon, by using a pointing device in 11: 40-43 and Fernandes shows a collaborative routing system which allows the user to route or share documents from one user to another in column 12, lines 51-68), *wherein the object computer is operable to activate a local file processing function on the processing computer, wherein an object processing platform is generated by moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer, and wherein activating the local file processing function comprises moving the object from the object computer to the interaction area* (Fernandes shows routing the created or stored document by dragging the representative icon to the desired user icon/interaction area in 11: 35-55. Fernandes shows that the system routes the desired document from one user to another user or from one computer to another computer, 12: 58-68. The *interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer* can be the same interaction area as view by the object computer and processing computer since the object computer and the processing computer share and display the same type of graphical user interface

Art Unit: 2175

screen by logging into groupware system as shown in column 11, lines 34-63, column 12, lines 50-68, and Figs. 5 and 6.

**As for dependent claims 11 and 12:**

Claims 11 and 12 contain similar substantial subject matter as claimed in claims 5 and 6, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 04/23/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**Regarding 35 USC 103(a) rejection:**

**As for independent claim 4:**

8. Applicant argues *Fernandes fails to teach moving an object from a display belonging to the object computer to an interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer* (Applicant's Remarks, Pg. 5).

The Office respectfully disagrees.

9. It is noted that Fernandes shows the following limitations in Column 11, lines 35-55 and Column 12, lines 58-68. Fernandes shows routing the created or stored document by dragging the representative icon to the desired user icon/interaction area in 11: 35-55. Fernandes shows that the system routes the desired document from one user to another user or from one computer to another computer, 12: 58-68. The limitations argued by the applicant above is fairly broad. The *interaction area of a display belonging to the processing computer* can be the same interaction area as view by both the object computer and processing computer since the object computer and the processing computer share and display the same type of graphical user interface screen by logging into groupware system as shown in column 11, lines 34-63, column 12, lines 50-68, and Figs. 5 and 6.

**As for independent claims 7 and 10:**

With regard to independent claims 7 and 10, the applicant argues the same argument as presented above. Thus as indicated in the above discussion, the same rationale/rejection applies to independent claims 7 and 10.

***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Phantana-angkool whose telephone number is 571-272-2673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2175

DP  
/David Phantana-angkool/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/Adam L Basehoar/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178